

1

## **REMARKS**

2 These remarks follow the order of the paragraphs of the office action. Relevant portions of the  
3 office action are shown indented and italicized.

## ***DETAILED ACTION***

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6 *1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:*

7 *The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the  
8 manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms  
9 as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most  
10 nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode  
11 contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.*

12 *2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:*

13 *The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing  
14 out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his  
15 invention.*

16 *3. Claims 1-10, 17-18, 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing  
17 to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which  
18 was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to  
19 which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the  
20 invention.*

21 *Claim 1 recites a “buffer storing indications of events” in line 2, “said apparatus  
22 for transferring interrupts from the peripheral device to a host computer” in lines 9-10,  
23 “moving the contents of the buffer to the payload portion of the control data block, and  
24 sending the control data block to the host computer system” in lines 18-19. The  
25 recitations suggest that indications of events are stored in the buffer and that the  
26 indications of events (the contents of the buffer) are moved to a payload portion of the  
27 control data block and sending the control data block to the host computer system. The  
28 recitations also suggest that only interrupts from the indications of events (i.e. not the  
29 indications of events) are transferred from the peripheral device to the host computer  
30 system. It appears that the specification only discloses transferring all indications of  
31 events in the control block to the host computer.*

32 In response, the applicants respectfully states that the claims are amended to overcome the  
33 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

34 *4. Claims 11-16, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to  
35 comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which*

1        *was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to*  
2        *which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the*  
3        *invention.*

4        *It appears that there is no support for “moving the contents of the buffer to the*  
5        *corresponding fields of the payload portion” - as page 38, lines 25-26 merely discloses*  
6        *“when preset conditions are met, an Interrupt Control Block (ICB) 1680 is generated by*  
7        *the ISOC 120 from the information stored in the interrupt FIFO 1660”.*

8        In response, the applicants respectfully states that the claims are amended to overcome the  
9        rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

10        *5. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply*  
11        *with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not*  
12        *described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it*  
13        *pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.*

14        *Claim 13 recites “at least a predetermined plurality of indications is stored in the*  
15        *buffer”. Claim 14 recites “at least one indication is stored in the buffer”. Claim 15*  
16        *recites “a count indicative of the number of indications included in the payload portion”.*

17        *Claim 1 suggests storing only interrupts in the buffer and does not suggest*  
18        *storing indications other than interrupts in the buffer. The claims suggest that interrupts*  
19        *and indications are two different entities, while the specification only discloses only one*  
20        *entity being stored in the buffer and the count being indicative of only one entity.*

21        In response, the applicants respectfully states that the amendment to claim 1 should overcome the  
22        rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

23        *6. Claims 10, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply*  
24        *with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not*  
25        *described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it*  
26        *pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.*

27        *The examiner cannot find support for the limitations of the claims. In particular,*  
28        *it is not clear what constitute the claimed apparatus, the claimed host processing system,*  
29        *the claimed memory of the host processing system, the claimed data processing system,*  
30        *the claimed host computer, and the claimed memory of the host computer system.*

31        *Applicant is required to specifically point out where to find the support for the*  
32        *limitations of the claims in the specification, by page and line number - and in particular,*  
33        *applicant is required to map out each of the elements claimed with the teachings of the*  
34        *specification.*

1 In response, the applicants respectfully states that the support should be from in the claims as  
2 originally filed.

3 *7. No art rejection was made to claims 1-16, 21-22 because the scope of the claims is*  
4 *ambiguous, and it is not possible for the examiner to apply prior art without making a*  
5 *great deal of speculation.*

6 ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7 *8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form*  
8 *the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:*

9 *A person shall be entitled to a patent unless — (b) the invention was patented or*  
10 *described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale*  
11 *in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the*  
12 *United States.*

13 *9. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Raasch et*  
14 *al. (US 5,333,273).*

15 In response, the applicant respectfully states that Claims 17-20 are not made patentable by the  
16 invention of Raasch. The present invention, claimed in Claims 17-20, provides:

17 "Methods, systems and apparatus for transferring interrupts from a peripheral device to a  
18 host computer system is described. In an example embodiment, an apparatus comprises a  
19 buffer for storing indications of interrupts generated by the peripheral device. In response  
20 to a preset condition being met, a controller generates a control data block having a  
21 payload portion, moves the contents of the buffer to the payload portion of the control  
22 data block, and sends the control data block to the host computer system."

23 Whereas, the cited art to Raasch, US Patent 5,333,273, filed: September 3, 1992, is entitled:  
24 "Protected hot key function for microprocessor-based computer system". The abstract reads: "An  
25 ISA-compatible computer system includes an additional function key on its keyboard. The  
26 additional function key does not have a defined function for conventional ISA-standard  
27 computers. When a conventional alphanumeric key or function key is activated on the keyboard,  
28 the computer system is interrupted using IRQ1 and the key information is communicated to the  
29 computer system so that the computer system can respond in a conventional manner using a  
30 conventional keyboard interrupt handling routine. When the additional function key and an

1 alphanumeric key are activated in combination, a second interrupt different from the IRQ1  
2 interrupt is activated (e.g., IRQ15). The computer system responds to the second interrupt by  
3 inputting an identification of the activated alphanumeric key and performing a selected  
4 predetermined function in response thereto. The handling of the second interrupt is performed by  
5 a separate interrupt handling routine within the computer system so that conventional terminate  
6 and stay resident (TSR) programs that intercept conventional keyboard inputs cannot readily  
7 intercept keyboard input initiated by the additional function key ". Thus Raasch is not concerned  
8 with or teach. indications of events or a preset condition as in the claims. Thus, all claims are  
9 allowable.

10 *10. As per claims 17, 19, Raasch teaches a computer program product (or article of  
11 manufacture) comprising a computer usable medium [138, FIG. 1] having computer  
12 readable program code means [BIOS: col. 5, lines 18-21] embodied therein for causing  
13 transfer of interrupts [col. 4, lines 66-68], the computer readable program code means in  
14 said computer program product (or article of manufacture) comprising computer  
15 readable program code means [BIOS: col. 5, lines 18-21] for causing a computer (100,  
16 FIG. 1) to effect the functions of the apparatus of claim 1 (or the method of claim 11)- as  
17 the BIOS would cause a computer to effect the functions of any apparatus, hence  
18 including functions of the apparatus of claim 1; and as the BIOS would cause a computer  
19 to effect the steps of any method, hence including the steps of the method of claim 11.*

20 *11. As per claim 18, Raasch teaches a computer program product comprising a computer  
21 usable medium [138, FIG. 1] having computer readable program code means [BIOS:  
22 col. 5, lines 18-21] embodied therein for causing data processing [col. 5, lines 18-31],  
23 the computer readable program code means in said computer program product  
24 comprising computer readable program code means [BIOS: col. 5, lines 18-21] for  
25 causing a computer [100, FIG. 1] to effect the functions of the apparatus of claim 10 - as  
26 the BIOS would cause the computer to effect the functions of any apparatus, hence  
27 including the functions of the apparatus of claim 10.*

28 *12. As per claim 20, Raasch teaches a program storage device [138, FIG. 1] readable by  
29 machine [100, FIG. 1], tangibly embodying a program of instructions [BIOS: col. 5,  
30 lines 18-21] executable by the machine to perform method steps for transferring  
31 interrupts [col. 4, lines 66-68], said method steps comprising the steps of claim 11 (the  
32 BIOS would cause a computer to effect the steps of any method, hence including the steps  
33 of the method of claim 11).*

1 In response, the applicants respectfully states that Raasch is not concerned with or teach.  
2 indications of events or a preset condition as in the claims. The cited Raasch portion col. 5, lines  
3 18-21 reads:

4 The keyboard interrupt service routine may be located in the RAM 120 or it may be  
5 located in the ROM 138. Generally, the keyboard interrupt service routine for the  
6 keyboard is provided as a basic operating function of the computer system 100 and is  
7 stored in the ROM 138 as part of the Basic Input/Output System (BIOS) of the computer  
8 system.

9 The cited Raasch portion col. 4, lines 66-68 reads:

10 The interrupt controller 130, the DMA controller 132 and the interface circuitry 134  
11 provide communications between the processor bus 114 and an ISA bus 140.

12 This apparently fails to show the elements of claims 17-20. Thus, all claim 17-20 are allowable.

### 13 *Response to Arguments*

14 *13. Applicant's arguments filed February 19, 2008 have been fully considered but they  
15 are not persuasive.*

16 *A. With respect to the rejections of claims 1-10, 17-18, 21-22, applicant indicates that "a  
17 buffer storing indications of events" is recited on page 2, line 4. Page 2, line 4, however,  
18 recites "a buffer for storing indications of interrupts". Note that "indications of  
19 interrupts" and "indications of events" do not have the same meaning.*

20 *B. With respect to the rejections of claims 11-16, 19-20, applicant indicates that "moving the  
21 contents of the buffer to the corresponding fields of the payload portion" is recited on page 44,  
22 line 10. While the recitation is found on page 44, line 10, the recitation is part of a claim that  
23 does not have antecedent basis in the specification — as page 38, lines 25-26 merely discloses  
24 "when preset conditions are met, an Interrupt Control Block (ICB) 1680 is generated by the  
25 ISOC 120 from the information stored in the interrupt FIFO 1660".*

26 *C. With respect to the rejections of claims 13-15, applicant indicates the recitations are found  
27 on page 5, line 2; page 5, line 4; and page 5, line 7. The examiner found the recitations on  
28 pages, lines 4-5; page 5, lines 6-7; and pages, lines 9-10 instead. While the recitations can be  
29 found, the specification suggests storing only interrupts in the buffer and does not suggest  
30 storing indications in the buffer. The claims suggest that interrupts and indications are two*

1 *different entities, while the specification only discloses only one entity being stored in the buffer*  
2 *and the count being indicative of only one entity (the one entity being interrupts).*

3 *D. With respect to the rejections of claims 10 and 22, applicant does not adequately provide*  
4 *support for the claimed elements requested by the examiner.*

5 *E. With respect to the art rejections of claims 17-20, applicant argues that Raasch is not*  
6 *concerned with or teach indications of events or a preset condition as in the claims. Raasch was*  
7 *not relied upon to teach indications of events or a preset condition, because the claims do not*  
8 *require such limitations. Applicant appears to misinterpret the rejections.*

9 *Claim 17 only requires a program code means for causing transfer of interrupts,*  
10 *and a program code means for causing a computer to effect all functions of the apparatus*  
11 *of claim 1. Claim 18 only requires a program code means for causing a computer to*  
12 *effect all functions of the apparatus of claim 10. Claim 19 only requires a program code*  
13 *means for causing transfer of interrupts, and a program code means for causing a*  
14 *computer to effect all steps of the method of claim 11. Claim 20 only requires a program*  
15 *of instructions to perform method steps for transferring interrupts, the method steps*  
16 *comprising steps of the method steps of the method of claim 11.*  
17 *Raasch teaches a BIOS and transfer of interrupts (col. 4, lines 66-68; col. 5, lines*  
18 *16-21). A BIOS would cause a computer to effect the functions of any apparatus (i.e.*  
19 *including the functions of applicant's apparatus), and because a BIOS would cause a*  
20 *computer to effect/perform the steps of any method (i.e. including the steps of applicant's*  
21 *methods).*

22 *14. In addition, to help the examiner better understand the scope of the claimed invention and*  
23 *further the prosecution, the examiner requests that applicant identify - by reference to labels in*  
24 *the drawings, and/or page and line numbers in the specification - the following elements and/or*  
25 *steps: elements: apparatus, buffer, indications of interrupts, plurality of ports, peripheral device,*  
26 *host computer system, controller (in claim 1); communications device (in claims 8-9); data*  
27 *communications network interface (in claims 9-10); host processing system, data processing*  
28 *system (in claim 10) steps: the apparatus transferring interrupts, moving the contents of the*  
29 *buffer to the payload portion of the control data block (claim 1); storing interrupts, moving the*  
30 *contents of the buffer to the corresponding fields of the payload portion (in claim 11).*

31 *In the interview dated June 16, 2008, applicant identifies the followings:*  
32 *Apparatus is ISOC 120 [FIG. 17] Buffer is FIFO 1660 [FIG. 17] Interrupts are*

indications of events (i.e. “indications of interrupts” are therefore meaningless) Plurality of ports can be logical or physical — but no identification of a plurality of ports for a peripheral device was made Peripheral device is device 20 [FIG. 1] Host computer system is any of Host 10 [FIG. 1], or Host 10 [FIG. 17] Controller is inherent for generating control data block [1680, FIG. 17] Communication device is network adapter 80 [FIG. 2] Data communication network interface is network adapter 80 [FIG. 2] Host processing system is CPU SO [FIG. 1] Data processing system is ISOC 120 [FIG. 2] A memory in line 2 of claim 10 may not be memory 60 [FIG. 1, FIG. 17] Data communication interface is network adapter 80 [FIG. 2] Data communication network is network 30 [FIG. 1] The above identifications cannot support the followings: An apparatus [120, FIG. 17] moving the contents of the buffer [1660, FIG. 17] to the payload portion of the control data block, and sending the control data block to the host computing system [10, FIG. 17] via one port of the plurality of ports — as FIG. 17 shows sending the control data block [1680] to the host computing system through memory [60, FIG. 17], i.e. not through a port of the plurality of ports (of the peripheral device 20 — FIG. 1) — see lines 18-20 of claim 1.

*A data communication network interface [80, FIG. 2] comprising the communication device as claimed in claim 8 [i.e. communication device 80, FIG. 2] — see claim 9.*

*An apparatus [120, FIG. 17] comprising a host processing system [SO, FIG. 1] having a memory [not identified]...forming a data processing system [120, FIG. 17] for controlling flow of interrupts from the data communication interface [80, FIG. 2] to the memory of the host processing system because FIG. 1, FIG. 2 and FIG. 17 do not show the apparatus 120 comprising CPU SO — see claim 10.*

*The examiner is not quite sure what applicant intends to claim with the current claims. The examiner suggests that applicant maps the claims to the teachings of the disclosure, makes appropriate amendments, and requests an interview with the examiner to explain what is being claimed prior to filing a response to further prosecution of the application. Without understanding what applicant intends to claim, it is not possible for the examiner to properly examine the invention.*

31 Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper to deposit account 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_/Louis Herzberg/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Louis P. Herzberg  
Reg. No. 41,500  
Voice Tel. (845) 352-3194  
Fax. (845) 352-3194

38 3 Cloverdale Lane,  
39 Monsey, NY 1052  
40 Customer Number: 54856